



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/666,192	09/17/2003	Michael J. Munchhof	PC25291A	8786
28523	7590	03/15/2006	EXAMINER	
PFIZER INC. PATENT DEPARTMENT, MS8260-1611 EASTERN POINT ROAD GROTON, CT 06340			SHAMEEM, GOLAM M	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1626	

DATE MAILED: 03/15/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/666,192

Applicant(s)

MUNCHHOF ET AL.

Examiner

Golam M. M. Shameem, Ph.D.

Art Unit

1626

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 01 February 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-12 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 11 and 12 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-10 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>09/22/2004</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Priority

This application claims benefit for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) [to a provisional application 60/411,894 09/18/2002], is acknowledged.

Status of Claims

Claims 1-12 are currently pending in the application.

Receipt is acknowledged of amendment / response filed on February 01, 2006 and that has been entered.

Claims 11 and 12 are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 C.F.R. 1.142 (b) as being drawn to a non-elected subject matter.

Information Disclosure Statement

Receipt is acknowledged of Information Disclosure Statement (IDS), filed on 09/22/2004 and 02/20/2004, which has been entered in the file.

Response to Election/Restriction

In response to the restriction requirement, Applicants have elected Group I, which includes claims 1-10 drawn to compounds and compositions, and the elected species as set forth (Remarks, page 2) found in Example 1 on page 42 of the specification with traverse is acknowledged. The traversal is on the ground(s) that the nonelected pending claims 11 and 12 should be rejoined and examined with the elected Group I because there is no "serious burden" on the part of the Examiner and therefore, a search and examination of the entire Markush group should be made without a serious burden.

Applicant's arguments are fully considered and found unpersuasive because the products of Invention groups I-II differ materially in structure and in element from each other and therefore, are capable of supporting their own patents. The invention groups I-II are related to a set of structurally diverse and dissimilar compounds, compositions and their methods of uses (chemical structures, which are similar, are presumed to function similarly, whereas chemical structures that are not similar are not presumed to function similarly), which do not possess a substantial common core wherein a reference anticipating one would not necessarily render the other obvious and to search all the above groups in a single application would be an undue burden on the Examiner. Because of many classes and subclasses in each of the Group, a separate search considerations are involved, which would impose a serious burden on the Examiner to perform a complete search of the defined areas if unrestricted. Also the fields of search are not coextensive. The wide disparity among the groups requires that many divergent fields must be searched, including all classes and subclasses of U.S. and foreign patents as well as journals and publications. Moreover, the Examiner must perform a commercial database search on the subject matter of each group in addition to a paper search, which is quite burdensome to the Examiner. However, Examiner may reconsider to rejoin method of use claims commensurate in scope with the product claims when the case would be found in condition for allowance [provided those method claims are free from 35 U.S.C. §112 first (including written description, reach-through claim language and/or scope-enablement issues) and second paragraphs]. For these reasons, Applicant's arguments are found unpersuasive and, therefore, the requirement for restriction and election of species is still deemed proper.

Applicants preserve their right to file a divisional on the non-elected subject matter.

As set forth in the restriction requirement and an election of a single compound (or set of compounds), the invention will encompass all compounds that fall within the scope of the claim is as follows:

A compound having the formula as shown in claim 1 wherein:

R¹ is as limited to benzotriazole ring (as shown in claim 2),

R³ is as claimed,

R⁴ is as claimed except hydrogen and

R⁶ is as defined except hydrogen.

As a result of the election and the corresponding scope of the compound identified, claims 11 and 12 and the remaining subject matter of claims 1-10 are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142 (b) as being drawn to non-elected inventions. The withdrawn subject matter of claims 11 and 12 is properly restricted as it differs materially in structure and in element from the elected subject matter supra so as to be patentably distinct there from.

Double Patenting

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 1-10 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting, as being unpatentable over claims 1-14 of co-pending Application No. 10/783,251. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because both sets of claims are drawn to the same art recognized subject matter. This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented. The compounds taught by co-pending application is similar to instant application because a reference anticipating one set of claim will render the other obvious and it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made since Munchhof *et al* teach the generic compounds and compositions which are similar to the instantly claimed invention.

The subject matter claimed in the instant application is fully disclosed and covered in co-pending Application No. 10/783,251. Therefore, the disclosure of Munchhof *et al* that teach many permutation and combination substitutions (including various Markush variable substitutions, such as R¹, R³, R⁴ and R⁶ etc), which would easily place Applicants invention in possession of the public at the time of Applicants invention was filed. The indiscriminate selection of "some" among "many" is *prima facie* obvious, *In re Lemin*, 141 USPQ 814 (1964). Therefore, in the instant case, one skilled in the chemical art would be motivated to choose to replace various Markush variables (such as R⁴ and R⁶ taken together to form a fused heteroaromatic ring) in core structure to obtain the desired products in view of the known teaching of the art. The claimed compounds are so closely related structurally to the homologous and /or analogous compounds of the reference as to be structurally obvious therefore in the absence of any unobviousness or unexpected properties. Moreover, any other differences are but

obvious structural modifications, which would be apparent to one skilled in the chemical art that can use similar substitutions, would expect to have the same or essentially the same results. Therefore, in looking at the instant claimed compounds as a whole, the claimed compounds would have been suggested to one skilled in the art unless unobvious or unexpected results can be shown.

Objections

Claims 1-10 are objected to for containing non-elected subject matter. The claims should be amended to exclude non-elected subject matter and within the scope of elected compound.

Telephone Inquiry

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Golam Shameem, Ph.D. whose telephone number is (571) 272-0706. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday from 6:30 AM - 5:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Joseph McKane, can be reached at (571) 272-0699. The Unofficial fax phone number for this Group is (703) 308-7921. The Official fax phone numbers for this Group are (571)-273-8300.

When filing a FAX in Technology Center 1600, please indicate in the Header (upper right) "Official" for papers that are to be entered into the file, and "Unofficial" for draft documents and other communications with the PTO that are not for entry into the file of the application. This will expedite processing of your papers.


Communications via Internet e-mail regarding this application, other than those under 35 U.S.C. 132 or which otherwise require a signature, may be used by the applicant and should be

Art Unit: 1626

addressed to [joseph.mcKane@uspto.gov]. All Internet e-mail communications will be made of record in the application file. PTO employees will not communicate with applicant via Internet e-mail where sensitive data will be exchanged or where there exists a possibility that sensitive data could be identified unless there is of record an express waiver of the confidentiality requirements under 35 U.S.C. 122 by the applicant. See the Interim Internet Usage Policy published by the Patent and Trademark Office Official Gazette on February 25, 1997 at 1195 OG 89.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group receptionist, whose telephone number is (571) 272-1600.

Golam M M Shameem, Ph.D.
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1626
Technology Center 1600



GOLAM M. M. SHAMEEM, PH.D
PRIMARY EXAMINER

February 20, 2006